



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Nothing could be farther from ascertained and scientifically verified facts on the subject. One can hardly find terms in which to characterize the procedure which puts these things forth positively and dogmatically in a work intended for popular reading.

Dr. Aiken, evidently without any idea of traversing the views of Mr. Lillie in this his latest volume, has really furnished a complete and overwhelming refutation of it. He has done more, for his exposition of Buddhism is one of the best pieces of work on the subject in moderate compass that is available anywhere. He has studied the sources; he has worked with the masters; he has put his results in admirable order, and clothed them in clear English. This exposition of Buddhism fills 169 pages of his book. The remaining 150 pages are occupied with an examination of "the alleged relations of Buddhism with Christianity." In it he is not satisfied with controverting the broad and baseless generalizations and allegations of such writers as Mr. Lillie; he has hunted down their quotations, studied the contexts, and made his comparisons at first hand. In some cases he has found these quotations garbled; others have been misinterpreted; in others the context alters the significance. All this work he has done more thoroughly than any of his predecessors. It is to be hoped that he has done it once for all. But we have a secret fear that Mr. Lillie cannot be reached by rational argument, and will serenely continue to make other books out of the same flimsy material as before. At any rate, Dr. Aiken has performed a much-needed task so neatly and solidly as to put every lover of truth and fact in his debt. One must not fail to notice the twenty pages of bibliography at the end of the book—an invaluable list.

GEORGE S. GOODSPEED.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

ARARAT UND MASIS. Studien zur armenischen Altertumskunde und Litteratur. Von FRIEDRICH MURAD. Heidelberg: Winter, 1900. Pp. 104. M. 7.

THIS book, written soberly and with learning, explores the origin and literary history of that part of the Noachian legend which relates to Mount Ararat. Incidentally is given a good résumé of all we know both from the cuneiform inscriptions and from ancient writers of the earliest history of the Armenian race.

The following are some of the points which the writer, with clearness and complete mastery of the old Armenian literature, enforces:

(1) Ararat is the name, not of a mountain, but of a region or canton of old Armenia, which extended along the river Araxes. In the cuneiform texts it was the land of Urartu, the Alarodii of Herodotus, iii, 94, and vii, 79. (2) The original reading of the LXX in Gen. 8:4 was to the effect that the ark rested on the mountains of Ararat: ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη τοῦ Ἀραράτ (not τὰ Ἀραράτ); for so the old Armenian version renders it, and so Jerome understood it. To anyone acquainted with Armenia, to speak of Ararat as a mountain is as if you spoke of Wales as such. The Armenian name for the double peak called in Europe Ararat, the greater and the lesser, has ever been Masikh or Masis, the first of these two forms being a plural. (3) The Armenians had their own native legend of a flood and of an ark which rested on Masis—this at least as early as the first century of our era, long centuries before they adopted Christianity. Their neighbors equated this Armenian legend with the biblical one, and Josephus, *Antiq. Jud.*, I, 90 ff. (1, 3, 5) even asserts that the Armenians themselves called the place where the navigator of their ark—whom he identifies with Noah—stepped out by the name ἀποβατήριον, a true rendering of Nachidschewan, Ptolemy's Ναξουάνα, which lies southeast of Masis, about sixty miles from the summit. Jewish influence cannot possibly have led the Armenians at so remote a date to invent such a place-name, and give such an interpretation of it. (4) The Syrians of the east Tigris had floating among them, independently of the Jewish legend, a native story of a flood and of an ark which rested on the Djûdi mountain in the land of Kardû. Under the influence of this Syrian form of the legend, especially in the second and later centuries, Armenia and Ararat, Djûdi and the land of Kardû (*i. e.*, Gordyene), were all confused together; and this confusion is met with in Josephus, in Berosus (as cited in the Armenian form of Eusebius' *Chronicon*), and in the Jewish Aramaic Targums. The confusion, however, is relatively late, and does not represent the earlier form of the biblical myth, which clearly centered around a peak in Ararat and not in Gordyene, which lies far away to the southeast. (5) The Armenians themselves never identified the mountain on which the ark of Noah rested with their own Masis before the eleventh century. They located it instead, no doubt under Syrian influence, in Gordyene. In their fifth-century writers we have many descriptions of the province of Ararat, but no allusion to Noah and his ark. A passage of Faustus, the historian (about 450 A. D.), relating that the ark rested on the mountain of Ararat in the land of Kardû, is an interpolation.

Murad denies that the biblical form of the myth directly flowed from

the forms in which the cuneiform inscriptions and Berosus give it, but admits that it is derived from an older form, from which those also were ultimately derived. As to why the Jews connected the ark of Noah with the mountains of Ararat or Urartu — a country with which they were, it is clear from the references in 2 Kings 19 : 37 and Jer. 51 : 27, quite well acquainted — Murad pronounces no definite opinion. Nor does he suggest a reason which appears to me to be plausible why the Armenians, after they had been Christianized, abstained from the identification, hinted at in Josephus and accepted by Jerome, of Noah's mountain with their own Masis. Their reason, I believe, was this, that Masis was already the scene of a similar and native Armenian legend, with which on religious grounds they scrupled to identify the story they now read in the Scriptures. Masis was anyhow a center and focus of pagan myths and cults, which the author enumerates; and it was only in the eleventh century, after these had vanished from the popular mind, that the Armenian theologians ventured to locate on its eternal snows the resting-place of Noah's ark.

F. C. CONYBEARE.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE,
Oxford, Eng.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. By REV. FRANCIS E. GIGOT. New York: Benziger, 1900. Pp. 606. \$2 net.

THIS is the first of a series of three volumes projected by the same author on biblical introduction. The volume in hand is divided into three parts: (1) "Biblical Canonics," (2) "Biblical Textual Criticism," and (3) "Biblical Hermeneutics;" to these are added an appendix on "Biblical Inspiration," and also nineteen plates, taken chiefly from Kenyon's *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*. The point of view of the author is that of a Roman Catholic. He starts out with the premises and the methods of one who believes in the authority and inspiration of the church with as much tenacity as he does in these elements of the Bible. On the basis of these premises he examines the so-called Protestant positions, especially those advocated by the biblical criticism of the day. With commendable fairness he shows from his point of view the weakness of the Protestant position and the strength of his own. The work contains no new material. The author has as a rule made use of the latest French, German, and English works touching his theme, and presents his material in an orderly and systematic manner, suitable for class-room and text-book methods. It is to be regretted that